

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MUWSA GREEN,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:12-CV-321
Plaintiff	:	
	:	(Judge Conner)
v.	:	
	:	
JOSEPH NISH, et al.,	:	
Defendants	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 14th day of November, 2012, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 64), recommending that plaintiff's motions for leave to file amended and supplemental complaints (Docs. 53 and 56) be denied, and, following an independent review of the record and noting that plaintiff filed objections¹ to the report on October 17, 2012 (Doc. 66), and the court finding Judge Carlson's analysis to be thorough and well-reasoned, and the court finding plaintiff's objections to be without merit and squarely addressed by Judge Carlson's Report (Doc. 64), it is hereby ORDERED that:

¹ Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. Supinski v. United Parcel Serv., Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing Sample v. Diecks, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" Id. (citing Shields v. Astrue, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Carlson (Doc. 64) are ADOPTED.
2. Plaintiff's motions for leave to file amended and supplemental complaints (Docs. 53 and 56) are DENIED.
3. The above-captioned case is REMANDED to Magistrate Judge Carlson for further proceedings.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge